UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/617,607	07/11/2003	Peng T. Ong	59995-8002.US01	2901

22918   7590   01/30/2008

PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. BOX 2168
MENLO PARK, CA 94026

EXAMINER
JOHNSON, CARLTON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _23 October 2007_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/ are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

       1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 10/23/2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY

REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the

following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply

under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied

by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130,

1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

2.   This action is responding to application papers filed on **7-11-2003**. Claims **1 - 20**

are pending. Claims **1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15** have amended. Claims **1, 11, 15, 16,**

17, 18 are independent.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments filed 10/23/2007 have been fully considered but they are

moot due to new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5.   Claims **1 - 3, 10 - 13, 15 - 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second

paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the

subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "totality" is not

mentioned in the specification or the original claims.   The specification mentions a

plurality of applications accessible by a user or displayed in a view.   This is new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims **1, 3, 6, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over **Schaeck et al.** (US Patent No. **20030163513**) in view of **Cotte** (US

PGPUB No. **20040013132**).

Regarding Claims 1, 11, 15, Schaeck discloses a method, apparatus for providing a

system administrator with a view of a totality of application accessible by a user,

comprising:

   a) identifying a plurality of applications (see Schaeck paragraph [0037], lines 1-5:

      service equivalent to application; paragraph [0066], lines 5-10: aggregation of

      services or applications) accessible by a user by examining authentication

credential container of the user; (see Schaeck paragraph [0066], lines 1-5,

paragraph [0081], lines 1-11: examine user authentication credentials; paragraph

[0022], lines 1-3: profile or credentials container) and

b) generating a view of the plurality of applications accessible by the user. (see

Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of

multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications; paragraph [0044], lines

1-4: user actions, accessible by the user)

c) a view of displayer to display the view of the plurality of applications accessible

by the user to the administrator. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7;

paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services

or applications; paragraph [0045], lines 7-12: role of administrator, view of

application (i.e. services))

Schaeck does not specifically disclose a totality of applications. However, Cotte

discloses a totality of applications for: a); b); c); (see Cotte paragraph [0116], lines 1-

7: total number of application possible)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Schaeck

as taught by Cotte to enable the capability for a totality of applications. One of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Cotte

in order to enable the capability to realizing advantages, such as privacy, ease of

use, and/or data communications capabilities, offered by available communications

environments. (see Cotte paragraph [0022], lines 1-5: " ... *The present invention*

may be employed to overcomes disadvantages existing in known communications

environments while realizing advantages, such as privacy, ease of use, and/or data

communications capabilities, offered by available communications environments.

...")

Regarding Claims 3, 13, Schaeck discloses the method, apparatus of claims 1, 11

further comprising providing an interface to assist in removing access to an application

from the totality of the applications by utilizing the view of the plurality of the applications

accessible by the user. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068],

lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications;

paragraph [0043], lines 9-15: delete or remove access to a service or application)

Schaeck does not specifically disclose a totality of applications. However, Cotte

discloses a totality of applications. (see Cotte paragraph [0116], lines 1-7: total number

of application possible)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Schaeck as

taught by Cotte to enable the capability for a totality of applications. One of ordinary

skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Cotte in order to

enable the capability to realizing advantages, such as privacy, ease of use, and/or data

communications capabilities, offered by available communications environments. (see

Cotte paragraph [0022], lines 1-5)

Regarding Claim 6, Schaeck discloses the method of claim 3 wherein the removing is

performed automatically. (see Schaeck paragraph [0044], lines 1-10: data-oriented or

presentation interface, data-oriented interface designates an automatic interface between client and server; paragraph [0043], lines 9-15: delete or remove access to a service or application)

Regarding Claim 16, Schaeck discloses a method for providing a system administrator with a list of a totality of applications accessible by a user, comprising:

a) identifying the plurality of applications accessible by the user by examining an authentication credential container of the user; (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications; paragraph [0045], lines 7-12: role of administrator, view of application (i.e. services)); (There is no disclosure in the specification or the original claims to display a totality of applications accessible. This is new matter and will not be addressed)

b) generating a list of the plurality of applications accessible by the user; (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications; paragraph [0045], lines 7-12: role of administrator, view of application (i.e. services)); (There is no disclosure in the specification or the original claims to display a totality of applications accessible. This is new matter and will not be addressed) and

c) displaying the list to the administrator. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications; paragraph [0045], lines 7-12: role of administrator, view of

application (i.e. services))

Schaeck does not specifically disclose a totality of applications. However, Cotte

discloses a totality of applications for: a); b); (see Cotte paragraph [0116], lines 1-7:

total number of application possible)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Schaeck

as taught by Cotte to enable the capability for a totality of applications. One of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Cotte

in order to enable the capability to realizing advantages, such as privacy, ease of

use, and/or data communications capabilities, offered by available communications

environments. (see Cotte paragraph [0022], lines 1-5)

Regarding Claim 17, Schaeck discloses a method for providing a system administrator

with a list of a totality of applications accessible by a user together with any user names

and passwords used in connection with those applications, comprising:

a) identifying the plurality of applications accessible by the user and any user

names and passwords used in connection with the totality of applications by

examining an authentication credential container of the user; (see Schaeck

paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or

plurality of accessible services or applications; paragraph [0045], lines 7-12: role

of administrator, view of application (i.e. services)); (There is no disclosure in the

specification or the original claims to display a totality of applications accessible.

This is new matter and will not be addressed)

b) generating a list of the plurality of applications accessible by the user together with any user names and passwords used in connection with the totality of applications; (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications; paragraph [0045], lines 7-12: role of administrator, view of application (i.e. services)); (There is no disclosure in the specification or the original claims to display a totality of applications accessible. This is new matter and will not be addressed) and

c) displaying the list to the administrator. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications; paragraph [0045], lines 7-12: role of administrator, view of application (i.e. services))

Schaeck does not specifically disclose a totality of applications. However, Cotte discloses a totality of applications for: a); b); (see Cotte paragraph [0116], lines 1-7: total number of application possible)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Schaeck as taught by Cotte to enable the capability for a totality of applications. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Cotte in order to enable the capability to realizing advantages, such as privacy, ease of use, and/or data communications capabilities, offered by available communications environments. (see Cotte paragraph [0022], lines 1-5)

8.   Claims **2, 4, 5, 7 - 10, 12, 14, 18 - 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over **Schaeck-Cotte** and further in view of **Delany et al.** (US Patent

No. **20020138763**).

Regarding Claims 2, 12, Schaeck discloses the method, apparatus of claims 1, 11

wherein the view of the plurality of the applications. (see Schaeck paragraph [0068],

lines 4-8: aggregated view of services or applications based on user role view;

paragraph [0043], lines 5-7: multiple services or applications)

Schaeck does not specifically disclose a totality of applications. However, Cotte

discloses a totality of applications for: a); b); c); (see Cotte paragraph [0116], lines 1-7:

total number of application possible)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Schaeck as

taught by Cotte to enable the capability for a totality of applications.   One of ordinary

skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Cotte in order to

enable the capability to realizing advantages, such as privacy, ease of use, and/or data

communications capabilities, offered by available communications environments. (see

Cotte paragraph [0022], lines 1-5)

Schaeck-Cotte does not specifically disclose a consolidated directory of the plurality of

the applications. However, Delany discloses wherein a consolidated directory of the

plurality of the applications. (see Delany paragraph [0113], lines 13-18, paragraph

[0129], lines 16-20: LDAP, consolidated user based directory information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Schaeck-Cotte as taught by Delany to enable a consolidated directory of the plurality of the applications.   One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Delany in order to, within a consolidated view or a single source, enable the addition and removal of directory entry attributes for an existing group.   (see Delany paragraph [0014], lines 4-7: " ... *Over time, an administrator may discover that using a dynamic membership rule is a mistake for this group because the number of members is growing too fast. ...* "; paragraph [0014], lines 10-14: " ... *since the group has already been created and used, prior systems do not allow for the modification of the group by removing the attribute for storing a dynamic membership rule. ...* ")

Regarding Claims 4, 14, Schaeck discloses the method, apparatus of claims 1, 11 further comprising:

wherein the user utilizing the generated view. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications), and injecting authentication information of the user account into the authentication credential container of the user. (see Schaeck paragraph [0052], lines 11-15: script program utilizing in the processing of authentication information, authentication information placed or "injected" within authentication process via script technology)   Schaeck does not specifically disclose creating a user account for a new application to be accessible by the user.

However, Delany discloses:

a) creating a user account for a new application to be accessible by the user; (see Delany paragraph [0108], lines 1-8; paragraph [0109], lines 12-16: create user accounting information) and

b) authentication information of the user account into the authentication credential container of the user. (see Delany paragraph [0108], lines 1-8; paragraph [0109], lines 12-16: create user accounting information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Schaeck as taught by Delany such that the authentication credential container is stored at a server. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Delany in order to, within a single source or consolidate view, enable the addition and removal of user accounting and authentication attributes for an existing group using a server or a centralized source. (see Delany paragraph [0014], lines 4-7; paragraph [0014], lines 10-14)

Regarding Claim 5, Schaeck discloses the method of claim 4 wherein the authentication credential container and a server. (see Schaeck paragraph [0066], lines 1-5, paragraph [0081], lines 1-11: examine user authentication credentials; paragraph [0051], lines 1-6; paragraph [0075], lines 1-4: authentication server system; paragraph [0022], lines 1-3: profile or credentials container) Schaeck does not specifically disclose wherein the authentication credential container stored at a server. However, Delany discloses wherein authentication credential container is stored at a server. (see Delany paragraph [0128], lines 1-3; paragraph [0129], lines 1-4: database manager, profile or

authentication information under control of directory server and database server)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified

Schaeck as taught by Delany such that the authentication credential container is stored

at a server.   One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the

teachings of Delany in order to enable, within a single source or a consolidate view from

a server, centralized access to user accounting and authentication attributes for an

existing group.   (see Delany paragraph [0014], lines 4-7; paragraph [0014], lines 10-14)

Regarding Claim 7, Schaeck discloses the method of claim 4 wherein processing user

account information is performed automatically. (see Schaeck paragraph [0044], lines

1-10: data-oriented or presentation interface, data-oriented interface designates an

automatic interface) Schaeck does not specifically disclose the creation of a user

account. However, Delany discloses wherein creating the user account. (see Delany

paragraph [0108], lines 1-8; paragraph [0109], lines 12-16: create user accounting

information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified

Schaeck as taught by Delany to create the user account.   One of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Delany in order to enable the

utilization of multiple methods, such as a manual or an automatic method, for the

update of user attributes.   (see Delany paragraph [0014], lines 4-7; paragraph [0014],

lines 10-14)

Regarding Claim 8, Schaeck discloses the method of claim 4 wherein processing the

user account information is performed manually by an administrator. (see Schaeck

paragraph [0044], lines 1-10: data-oriented or presentation interface, presentation

interface designates a manual interactive interface) Schaeck does not specifically

disclose the creation of a user account. However, Delany discloses wherein creating

the user account. (see Delany paragraph [0108], lines 1-8; paragraph [0109], lines 12-

16: create user accounting information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified

Schaeck as taught by Delany to creating the user account.   One of ordinary skill in the

art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Delany in order to enable the

utilization of multiple methods, such as a manual or an automatic method, for the

update of user attributes.   (see Delany paragraph [0014], lines 4-7; paragraph [0014],

lines 10-14)

Regarding Claim 9, Schaeck discloses the method of claim 4 wherein the

authentication information is injected into a hardware device of the user. (see Schaeck

paragraph [0052], lines 11-15: script program utilizing in the processing of

authentication information, authentication information placed or "injected" within

authentication process via script technology)   Schaeck does not specifically disclose

creating a user account for a new application to be accessible by the user.   However,

Delany discloses wherein creating a user account. (see Delany paragraph [0108], lines

1-8; paragraph [0109], lines 12-16: create user accounting information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified

Schaeck as taught by Delany to creating a user account. One of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Delany in order to enable the

utilization of multiple methods, such as an automatic or script technology method for the

update of user attributes. (see Delany paragraph [0014], lines 4-7; paragraph [0014],

lines 10-14)

Regarding Claim 10, Schaeck discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising user

directories for each application of the plurality of the applications accessible by the user.

(see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of

multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications)   Schaeck does not

specifically disclose removing individual directories for each application. However,

Delany disclose wherein removing individual user directories for each application. (see

Delany paragraph [0108], lines 1-8; paragraph [0109], lines 12-16: delete or remove

user accounting information or user directories)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified

Schaeck as taught by Delany to enable removing individual user directories for each

application. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the

teachings of Delany in order to enable, within a single source or consolidate view,

enable the addition and removal of user accounting and authentication attributes for an

existing group using a centralized source. (see Delany paragraph [0014], lines 4-7;

paragraph [0014], lines 10-14)

Regarding Claim 18, Schaeck discloses a method for providing a system administrator with a consolidated directory of a totality of applications accessible by a user, the method comprising:

  a) identifying the plurality of applications accessible by the user by examining authentication credential container of the user; (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications; paragraph [0045], lines 7-12: role of administrator, view of application (i.e. services)); (There is no disclosure in the specification or the original claims to display a totality of applications accessible. This is new matter and will not be addressed)

  b) generating a directory of the plurality of applications accessible by the user; (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications; paragraph [0045], lines 7-12: role of administrator, view of application (i.e. services)); (There is no disclosure in the specification or the original claims to display a totality of applications accessible. This is new matter and will not be addressed) and

  c) displaying the directory to the administrator; ((see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications; paragraph [0045], lines 7-12: role of administrator, view of application (i.e. services)))

the directory comprising:

d) a name of the user; (see Schaeck paragraph [0059], lines 16-24: userid (i.e. other credentials), password)

e) a list of keys employed by the user also detailing the type and serial number of each key; (There is no disclosure in the specification or the original claims that keys are stored in the directory. This is new matter and will not be addressed.)

h) a list of all certificate enabled applications accessible by the user also specifying a user name of the user and a last login attempt of the user; (There is no disclosure in the specification or the original claims that a last login attempt is stored or processed, and to display a list of all certificate enabled applications. This is new matter and will not be addressed)

j) a list of all enterprise applications accessible by the user also specifying a user name of the user and a last login attempt of the user; (There is no disclosure in the specification or the original claims that a last login attempt is stored or processed. This is new matter and will not be addressed) and

k) a list of all personal application accessible by the user also specifying a number of accounts connected to each personal application; (There is no disclosure in the specification or the original claims to display a list of the number of accounts connected to each personal application. This is new matter and will not be addressed)

Schaeck does not specifically disclose a totality of applications. However, Cotte discloses a totality of applications for: a); b); (see Cotte paragraph [0116], lines 1-7: total number of application possible)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Schaeck as taught by Cotte to enable the capability for a totality of applications. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Cotte in order to enable the capability to realizing advantages, such as privacy, ease of use, and/or data communications capabilities, offered by available communications environments. (see Cotte paragraph [0022], lines 1-5)

And, Delany discloses:

f) a profile of the user detailing a role of the user, a name of the user, an email address of the user, a department of the user, an employee ID of the user, and any additional attributes of the user that have been specified; (see Schaeck paragraph [0108], lines 1-8; paragraph [0109], lines 12-16: process user profile information, account, role of user, administrator)

g) a means of updating and resetting the profile; (see Delany paragraph [0108], lines 1-8; paragraph [0109], lines 12-16: update profile information)

i) a means of deleting the user name of the user; (see Delany paragraph [0108], lines 1-8; paragraph [0109], lines 12-16: remove user profile (i.e. account) information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Schaeck as taught by Delany to enable the processing of user profile (i.e. user account) information. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Delany in order to enable, within a single source or consolidate view, enable the addition and removal of user accounting and

authentication attributes for an existing group using a centralized source. (see

Delany paragraph [0014], lines 4-7; paragraph [0014], lines 10-14)

Regarding Claim 19, Schaeck discloses the consolidated directory of claim 18, further

comprising: a specification of a password for each certificate enabled application, each

enterprise application, and each personal application. (see Schaeck paragraph [0059],

lines 16-24: password required for access to applications)

Regarding Claim 20, Schaeck discloses the consolidated directory of claim 18, further

comprising:

a) means for a system administrator to add one or more applications to the lists of

the certificate enabled applications, the enterprise applications, or the personal

applications of the user; (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 13-15: add or

update application list) and

b) means for a system administrator to delete one or more applications from the

lists of the certificate enabled applications, the enterprise applications, or the

personal applications. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 13-15: delete

accounts)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Carlton V. Johnson whose telephone number is 571-

270-1032. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday , 8:00 -

5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Carlton V. Johnson
Examiner
Art Unit 2136

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

CVJ
January 22, 2008